



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/051,565 | 06/08/1998 | DIRK SELDESLACHTS | 98227 | 8146 |

7590 01/11/2002

BACHMAN & LAPOINTE
900 CHAPEL STREET
SUITE 1201
NEW HAVEN, CT 065102802

EXAMINER

SHERRER, CURTIS EDWARD

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1761

19

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/051,565

Applicant(s)
Seldeslachts

Examiner
Curtis E. Sherrer

Group Art Unit
1761

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Curtis E. Sherrer

(3) _____

(2) Barry L. Kelmachter

(4) _____

Date of Interview Dec 11, 2001

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: Specifically, claims 28 and 57 and 63

Identification of prior art discussed:

Kruger et al, and Perry's Chemical Engineering Handbook

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant has already mailed in the response to the last Office Action. Applicant stated the 90% of the orifice surface occurs in the corrugated portions of the plate. Has argued that Perry teaches away from combining the disclosed apparatus with the method of Kruger et al. Further, he argued that there is no motivation to combine the teachings. Stated that the amendments to the drawings have been canceled. Further argued that the drawings only need disclose that which is necessary to understand the invention. The Examiner will review the rejections in light of the amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached



CURTIS E. SHERRER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1761

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.